

Meeting Report

CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURAL CENTER AND MUSEUM TASK FORCE
PUBLIC MEETING
Wednesday, August 20th, 2003

**Resources Building, Room 1411
1416 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814**

Task Force Members and/or Designees present: Loren Bommelyn, Gen Denton, John Gomez, Jr., Cindy La Marr, Larry Myers, Pilar Onate, Charlene Simmons, Michael Sweeney (Bill Mungary absent)

DPR Staff present: Maria Baranowski, Billie Blue-Elliston, Leo Carpenter, Jr., Pauline Grenbeaux, Paulette Hennum, Steve Hill, Tara Lynch, Stephanie Schiele

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson La Marr called the meeting to order at 9:15 am. Denton gave the opening blessing.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Task Force (TF) members and staff introduced themselves.

2. REPORTS FOR MEETINGS OF MAY 29-30 AND JULY 9

Grenbeaux noted one correction to notes from the previous meeting (May 29 – 30): Charlene Simmons was present.

La Marr requested that actions and significant decisions of the TF be formalized in the conventional way of move, second, and vote, so that they can be recorded in the meeting notes more easily.

Myers moved to accept the notes for July 9, and for May 29-30 with the correction; Gomez seconded; the TF approved the motion.

TASK FORCE FUNDING AND FUTURE MEETINGS

1. COSTS FOR TASK FORCE TRAVEL

Grenbeaux reviewed a handout listing costs for TF travel to attend TF meetings and to attend community meetings throughout the State. She noted that while staff can attend community meetings on the project's behalf, it is not the same as having a TF member present. The California State Parks Foundation (CSPF) has paid for travel (and the kick-off reception) up to now, but we have exhausted the available funds.

CSPF has researched and applied for grants to fund the rest of the TF meetings. The effort has been unsuccessful so far. Meetings are not what funders like to fund, and most would rather fund programs and prefer underwriting tribal projects. Big funders have long grant cycles.

CSPF has offered to underwrite a workshop for the next TF meeting on setting up foundations and shared governance issues. They will pay for the travel associated with that workshop. A letter in packet of handouts explains their offer and solicits questions for the workshop.

2. SOLICITATION LETTER

La Marr intended to write a letter to all tribes soliciting donations, but decided not to do so: she had difficulty in doing this, doesn't want to do a blanket letter, and would rather target several tribes. Myers agreed that sending letters to targeted people is the most effective way. Gomez suggested getting a cover letter from Senator Brulte's office endorsing the project, as it would carry a lot of weight particularly with Southern tribes. La Marr stated that she sent out a letter to tribal chairs after the May meeting that described the project and solicited comment. She has had no feedback and no complaints.

Simmons said that the next letter will need to clearly articulate that the State is prohibited from paying these expenses, as most people aren't aware of this. Denton acknowledged that everyone was told ahead of time that funds for travel were not available.

3. TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Tentative topics for the next meetings are: foundations and governance (workshop), site selection, fundraising, master plan, committee work, increased communication with the Indian community.

Based on information submitted by TF members, September 22-23 works best for most to attend a two-day meeting. La Marr suggested that some committee work be done in conjunction with it. [Note: This meeting date was subsequently changed to October 3-4.]

La Marr spoke with Rick West, Director of the National Museum of the American Indian, and he has agreed to come out to speak with the TF. Myers suggested

having a fundraising reception around his visit. Grenbeaux noted that a sponsor would be needed.

Simmons said that if we are looking at site selection, we need to look at contributions that local governments might make and long-term sustainability. It was noted that Baranowski would discuss this briefly further in today's agenda.

La Marr asked Simmons to report on the meeting with State Librarian Kevin Starr and La Marr, Simmons, Myers, and Grenbeaux. The subject of the meeting was the grants program that will be administered by the State Library. There will be \$128 million to distribute over the next three years. Start-up is delayed waiting for the State Assembly Speaker to make his final appointment to the board that oversees the endowment. Per Starr, decisions could be made as soon as late winter early spring. Starr felt that the CICCM would be a very competitive project. We need to have a funding proposal ready to submit.

Oate pointed out that such funding would be a lump sum for capital development, not a dedicated stream for operations. La Marr said that we might need to get an appropriation to ensure steady funding in future. Simmons pointed out that funders couldn't be approached without a mission and vision statement.

VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS

1. MISSION STATEMENT
2. REVIEW OF WORKSHOP FACILITATOR'S STATEMENT

La Marr introduced Josie Talamantaz who led the TF through the process of drafting a mission statement. Talamantez is Assistant Chief of Grants Programs at the California Arts Council, and also on the Board of Capitol Area Indian Education.

La Marr asked Bommelyn to open this part of the meeting.

The TF looked at various examples of mission statements to get a sense of how diverse they can be. The TF was reminded that a mission statement – while considered permanent -- may be changed if needed. Mission needs to be all encompassing; vision is more concrete.

The TF looked at information provided by Steve Christiano as a summation of the workshop he facilitated in May. It includes a suggested mission statement and a vision statement.

There was general discussion about what exactly the statement should say. Members discussed the use of various words. Some object to the word "mission" because of its historical associations. "Purpose" or "intent" will be used instead.

One example of a purpose statement was put on the whiteboard and rewritten in segments.

There was acknowledgement that the TF might not be able to achieve consensus at this meeting. The possibility was raised of everyone finishing on his or her own and then sharing by email, but Lynch raised a legal point and recommended against that. Discussion continued and La Marr encouraged the group to try to get the purpose statement done today.

There was some discussion about the nature of the Center's involvement in research and training. Is it to be a place that houses an extensive documentary collection, or is it to be a "clearinghouse" through which researchers would be referred to other institutions for research on specific subjects? This will be discussed more later, but there was some agreement that research would be included in the purpose statement.

Consensus built around the following statement: *"CICCM acknowledges and honors the diversity and history of California Indian heritage through the preservation and continuation of cultural and tribal traditions; the nurturing of contemporary expressions; and the promotion and facilitation of education and research for the people of California and the world."*

The TF planned to hear public comment on the purpose statement later in the meeting. Staff was asked to have the drafted statement reviewed for grammar, spelling, and consistency, so it can be finalized at the next meeting. There was agreement that it could be used as the tentative purpose statement until then.

The TF took a short break at about 11:20.

3. VISION STATEMENT

A vision statement will be discussed at the next meeting in conjunction with the review of the purpose statement and review of the 1991 Study.

4. TASK FORCE REVIEW OF 1991 STUDY

Grenbeaux asked the members for their marked up copies of the notes on the 1991 Study to help prepare for future discussion.

NAME FOR NEW CENTER AND TASK FORCE

1. PROCESS FOR CHANGING THE NAME

Grenbeaux reminded the TF members that legislation needed to formally change the name of the CICCM and the CICCM Task Force would probably not go

through until next year. Never the less, there is a need to know as soon as possible what name the Task Force prefers for the new institution.

2. RECOMMENDATION

There was discussion about key terms. The term “museum” was not liked by many; “center” was preferred. “California Indian” was preferred to “Native American” or “indigenous”. “Cultural heritage” seemed very similar to “heritage.” Consensus built around the name “California Indian Heritage Center,” but the decision was delayed until after public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public was invited to comment.

- Louise McGuinness (HGA) encouraged use of word “celebration” somewhere in the purpose statement.
- Marilyn Jasper (Clover Valley Foundation) distributed a rough draft map of the Clover Valley property in Rocklin. She will return for the next meeting when site selection is on the agenda.
- (Mr.) Ashley George proposed some language for purpose statement. “The purpose of the Center should be to educate the public about California Indians’ art of survival, traditions, beliefs, and sacred way of life.”
- Billie Blue Elliston said the word “tribal” was disliked by many according to her discussions with California Indians in the course of her work. She said that she had spoken before the Folsom City Council as a private citizen about the Natoma site, and that they expressed a desire to work with the State on it. Following Elliston’s comments, there was some discussion by the TF members about the use of word “tribal” in the purpose statement.

REPORT FROM STAFF

1. INFORMATION ON FUNDING FOR STATE MUSEUMS

Grenbeaux called attention to statistical information in the handouts on funding and visitor attendance at Capitol area historical museums that had been requested by a TF member at the last meeting. Also included is data about Indian Grinding Rock State Historic Park. If there are questions about these, Capitol District Superintendent Steve Hill can answer them at the next TF meeting.

Also for the next meeting, Grenbeaux requested that TF members send her any questions they want answered at the workshop on foundations, so that she can get them to Susan Smartt of the California State Parks Foundation.

2. SITE SELECTION PROCESS

Baranowski referred to the handouts on capital development budget and timeline. She reported that the five million dollars in funding that is available for the project is sufficient for the first phase. There is not much spent yet. "Spent" means money that is out-the-door. "Encumbrance" means money set aside for payment on a commitment already made. The only significant encumbrance to-date is a contract with CSUS for two assistants to help with coordinating meetings and contacts with the Indian community. According to Grenbeaux, interviews have been held through CSU's Center for Collaborative Policy, and the individuals should be joining the project staff in September. (No names announced.) Recruiting was successful.

At the next TF meeting, there will be a document for the members to review regarding site selection. This will be a draft for requesting proposals for sites from local governments prepared with input from TF members Mungary and Myers. At end of that meeting, we should have a document that will enable the real estate people to know the kind of site they need to be looking for. Staff can't start looking until the TF comes to agreement on the characteristics and features they want for the site.

La Marr asked if it was premature to set up meetings with various local governments (i.e. Rocklin, Folsom) who have expressed interest in working with us. Baranowski said that we should have all pertinent specifics on our end ready to show before contacting them.

Baranowski explained that the process to solicit interest is surprisingly simple. Once the possible sites are identified, we will have a consultant look at them for financial feasibility, and real estate people look too. If the preferred site is clean (no toxins), it takes at least six months to acquire it. (If there are problems, it will be longer.) She will start preparing for those contracts now.

If we get clarity at next meeting on what is needed from the site, we can keep on schedule. The schedule gives us until May or June of 04 to make the final decision on a site [although a recommendation is to be made by the Task Force by next March per SB 2063.] In the meantime, she will be preparing a Request for Proposal for an architectural firm for the master plan. La Marr and Gomez are the TF members that will be assisting with this.

There was some additional discussion about how to get money through the California Endowment to augment the current development budget. DPR will

prepare a grant proposal. Preliminary figures from the feasibility study might be available by that time.

ACTIONS ON VISION , MISSION, AND NAME

Myers moved to accept “California Indian Heritage Center” as the preferred new name. Denton seconded, and the members approved .

La Marr said she would meet with Brulte’s office about legislation for the name change.

No formal actions were taken on vision or mission statements.

ADJOURNMENT

La Marr reminded Myers that he and Mungary will meet with Baranowski before the next TF meeting.

Simmons announced that there would be a reception at 5:30 in the Rotunda of the new State Library building tonight in conjunction with a meeting they are having on Seventh Generation plan. All are invited.

The meeting adjourned at 12:28 p.m. with a closing by Bommelyn.